

FROM :

FAX NO. : 7196336225

Oct. 24 2008 12:42PM P1

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 24 2008

FAX TRANSMITTAL COVER SHEET

DATE: Oct 24, 2008

TO: Examiner **S. Gravini** - USPTO Art Unit: **3749**

FROM: Frank McKiel
Ph: (719) 482-8464
Fax: (719) 633-6225

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES: 19 including cover sheet

RE: Interview Summary in Appl. No. 10/684,312

This transmission includes:

- Fax Cover Sheet (1 pg)
- Certificate of Transmission (1 pg)
- Interview Summary (responsive) (4 pgs)
- Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form (1pg)
- Copy of Examiner's Interview Summary (12 pgs incl. sketches)

NOTICE: This communication is confidential and intended only for the above named recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, or an agent thereof, be advised that any dissemination or use of the information contained herein is prohibited and may violate applicable laws. Please contact the sender to arrange for disposal of the received transmission.

FROM :

FAX NO. : 7196336225

Oct. 24 2008 12:42PM P2

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 24 2008

PTO/SB/97 (09-08)

Approved for use through 10/31/2008. OMB 0651-0031

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it contains a valid OMB control number.

Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office

on Oct 24, 2008
Date


Signature

FRANK MCKIEL, JR.

Typed or printed name of person signing Certificate

43,792

Registration Number, if applicable

719-482-8464

Telephone Number

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of transmission, or this certificate must identify each submitted paper.

- INTERVIEW SUMMARY BY APPLICANT 4 pgs
- APPLICANT INITIATED INTERVIEW REQUEST FORM 1 pg
- COPY OF EXAMINER'S INTERVIEW SUMMARY 12 pgs.

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.8. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 1.8 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

FROM :

FAX NO. : 7196336225

Oct. 24 2008 12:43PM P3

Appl. No. 10/684,312

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

OCT 24 2008

In re application of :

SCHNEIDER, D. G.

Serial No.: 10/684,312

Art Unit: 3749

Filed: October 10, 2003

Examiner: S. Gravini

Atty Docket: DGS001

Confirmation No: 3321

For: COLLAPSIBLE HEATING APPARATUS

INTERVIEW SUMMARY UNDER 37 CFR 1.133(b)

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to an Interview Summary form received from Examiner Gravini and having been mailed from the Office on September 25, 2008, Applicant submits the following responsive Interview Summary as required to make of written record before the Office the substance of the telephonic interview that occurred on September 3, 2008. This response is believed to be timely filed and in compliance with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.133(b) and MPEP 713.04. If this submission is found lacking in any essential respect, the Office is urged to contact the Applicant to expeditiously resolve any such issues.

A copy of the Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form, as well as the Examiner's Interview Summary is attached hereto. Please note that a reply to the most recent Office Action was already filed before the Examiner's Interview Summary was received. References to the 'Applicant' below are understood to mean the named Applicant or a representative duly acting on Applicant's behalf.

Appl. No. 10/684,312

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 24 2008

INTERVIEW SUMMARY BY APPLICANT

Applicant thanks Examiner Gravini for the courtesy extended in a recent telephonic interview.

Applicant has reviewed an Interview Summary prepared by the Examiner and concurs that at least claims 1 and 6 were discussed, as well as others. In the Interview Summary, the Examiner indicates that agreement was reached and outlines a suggestion offered by the examiner early in the conversation. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees that the Examiner's initial suggestion is what was agreed upon. The discussion actually continued on to other avenues that Applicant believes were closer to being mutually agreeable.

For the record, the interview was conducted generally as follows: Before the interview, Applicant sent, via facsimile, a number of images derived from the photographs previously submitted as exhibits for a declaration under 37 CFR 1.131. These images were to assist Applicant in explaining the significance of the showings and to explain the operation of the unit. Applicant understood from the Examiner's remarks in the Final Office Action that image quality had been a problem and sought to provide clearer images to benefit the Examiner's efforts in reviewing the showings on their merits.

During the telephonic interview, Applicant's view of the Deichler reference was briefly explained and then the Examiner was invited to make any suggestions or proposals. Examiner offered a suggestion substantially along the lines of what he later described in his Interview Summary, namely trying to independently claim the volume-varying and size-varying aspects. Applicant then expressed concern over this approach. Consequently, this suggestion was not clearly agreed upon at the time and the discussion continued to further explain the operation of Applicant's invention in contrast to that of Deichler and explore possible interpretations of, or amendments to, the claims to satisfy the Examiner as to the allowability of the claims.

Examiner confirmed that the opening and closing of hinged doors in Diechler is the operation that is construed to meet applicant's recitation as to configuring of a side. Applicant respectfully disagreed but indicated a willingness to clarify, for example, the

Appl. No. 10/684,312

recitation of a 'configuration being selected by a user' by amending the claims, if necessary. Applicant proposed a 'wherein clause' or the like to further qualify the sense in which design aspects lend to configurability by the user, that is, the ability for the user to determine which panel or panels to include or exclude in constructing the unit and where on the unit to attach each panel or panels selected. Applicant explained that the permanently hinged unit of Deichler lacks any ability for the user to selectively include or exclude any of the doors and any ability for the user to change where each door would be attached in the overall unit. Examiner indicated that he would have to further consider that suggestion and was not prepared to decide on the proposal during the interview.

Applicant pointed out that at least claims 4 and 6 already contained language that should make clear that a panel is being selected by a user for inclusion or exclusion in constructing the unit rather than being permanently attached and merely opened or closed. Further, Applicant pointed to claims 11 and 12 to the effect that the side of the frame that is the configurable side, by virtue of selecting and inserting panels, also actively supports the grill or transverse member. No agreement was reached as to allowability based on these points.

Examiner's attention was then drawn to figures in the application and to corresponding images among the photographic exhibits. In particular, Applicant explained a comparison between Sheets 6A and 7A of the faxed images and between analogous Figures 5 and 4 in the application. These figures, as well as Figures 3 and 6, clearly show a restacking or reordering of panels 302, 304, 307 to achieve different configurations. This aspect was also reflected in the photographs for example in Sheets 6A and 7A where changing the grill-supporting height, necessarily required 'restacking' the order of the three different-sized panels that enclosed the backside.

Following this comparison and explanation by Applicant, the Examiner expressed having a better understanding of some aspect of Applicant's invention. The Examiner then offered a suggestion for Applicant to try claiming in terms of providing panels A, B and C of differing dimensions and describing inserting A atop B in some configurations and B atop A in others. Applicant made note of this suggestion but did not agree at that time to adopt that approach. Applicant considered that the selection and relative placement of A and B would already be expressed by Applicant's earlier proposal, e.g. a

Appl. No. 10/684,312

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

'wherein clause' describing the nature of the configurability afforded a user in
constructing a variably arranged side of the unit using a variety of available panels at
variable positions. Furthermore, Applicant was concerned that the Examiner's suggested
approach may unnecessarily preclude coverage of situations where only a single panel is
used in the assembly of a side of the unit (as in Fig. 4), with that panel being selected
from a set of candidate panels having different dimensions and achieving the same useful
ends of adjusting volume enclosed, coverage of a side and/or grill height.

Examiner suggested somehow expressing in the claims the 'purposefulness' of
selecting and placing specific panels to achieve, for example, a desired degree of
enclosure in the constructed unit. Applicant indicated that this avenue seemed generally
promising, although no specific language was mutually agreed upon. Examiner seemed
particularly favorable to Applicant's suggestion of placing some descriptive language of
this nature in the middle of the second element in independent claim 1.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits this Interview Summary as a true and accurate
representation of what transpired during the telephonic interview. Applicant appreciates
the suggestions and points raised by the Examiner, yet also urges the Examiner to
reconsider the allowability of the claims in view of arguments and explanations provided
during the conversation.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank McKiel, Jr.

Reg. No. 43,792

Date: 10 - 24 - 08

Correspondence Address:
Donna Gail Schneider
5880 Derby Rock Loop
Manitou Springs, CO 80829
(719) 685-4700